DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 294 928 TM 011 698

AUTHOR Galligani, Dennis J.
TITLE School/College Partnerships to Enhance Curriculum: A Statewide Qualitative Evaluation.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 63p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988); Appendices A and C contain small/smudged print.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Organization; College Faculty; *College Preparation; *Cooperative Programs; Curriculum Development; *Curriculum Enrichment; Higher Education; *Institutional Cooperation; Program Evaluation; Qualitative Research; Secondary Education; Secondary School Curriculum; Secondary School Teachers; State Programs
IDENTIFIERS *California Academic Partnership Program

ABSTRACT

In the summer of 1987, a qualitative evaluation report was published regarding the outcomes from 20 school/college partnership projects for enhancement of college preparatory curricula sponsored by the California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP) between 1984 and 1987. Most CAPP projects involve college and university faculty working together with junior high and high school teachers in curriculum development, which is designed to provide students with skills and information needed for their success in college. This paper: (1) describes a qualitative approach to evaluate the effectiveness of school/college partnership curriculum enhancement efforts; (2) describes the findings and recommendations of the qualitative evaluation report; and (3) assesses the impact of the evaluation report on the development of seven new school/college partnership efforts that began in the summer of 1987. Findings indicate means by which the 20 project directors indicated that curriculum enhancement projects could best be enhanced. Specifically, the results suggest answers to questions concerning characteristics that make an effective partnership for curriculum enhancement, optimal administrative structures, promotion of post-secondary faculty working with schools, incentives for inter-institutional cooperation, targeting of academic preparation efforts for underrepresented students, and unintended outcomes of partnership projects. Appendixes include a transcript of relevant legislation, a list of CAPP projects, a chart of CAPP project characteristics; a plan for evaluation sessions; and a copy of the survey instrument used in the study. (TJH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED294928

SCHOOL/COLLEGE PARTNERSHIPS TO ENHANCE CURRICULUM: A STATEWIDE QUALITATIVE EVALUATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

DENNIS J. GALLIGANI

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Dennis J. Galligani, Ph.D.

University of California, Irvine

Prepared for the American Educational Research Association's Annual Meeting

April 6, 1988
New Orleans, Louisiana

TM 011 698

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS ii

I. Summary..... Page 1

II. Background and Methodology of the Partnerships Curriculum Enhancement Report..... Page 3

A. The California Academic Partnership Program..... Page 3

B. The Curriculum Enhancement Partnership Projects. Page 4

C. Purpose of the Evaluation..... Page 4

D. Qualitative Evaluation Methodology..... Page 5

III. Primary Findings of the Study..... Page 10

A. General Characteristics..... Page 10

B. Administrative Structure..... Page 12

C. Faculty-To-Faculty Interaction..... Page 14

D. Successful Ways to Achieve Curriculum Enhancement..... Page 17

E. Promoting Academic Preparation Efforts for Underrepresented Students..... Page 18

F. The Unexpected: Unintended Project Outcomes.... Page 20

IV. Primary Recommendations of the Study..... Page 22

A. Characteristics Which Contribute to Effective Partnerships..... Page 22

B. Successful Ways to Achieve Curriculum Enhancement..... Page 26

C. Promoting Academic Preparation Efforts For Underrepresented Students..... Page 27

D. The Unexpected: Unintended Project Outcomes.... Page 28

V. Assessing the Usefulness/Helpfulness of the School/College Partnership Report..... Page 29

A. Method of Assessing Impact..... Page 29

B. Findings..... Page 31

C. Conclusions..... Page 37

VI. References..... Page 38

VII. Appendices..... Page 39

A. California Assembly Bill 2398..... Page 40

B. List of CAPP Curriculum Development Projects 1984-87..... Page 45

C. Characteristics of the California Academic Partnership Program Projects..... Page 48

D. Plan for Evaluation Sessions..... Page 51

E. Letter and Survey (with Frequencies) to New Project Directors..... Page 56

I. SUMMARY

In the summer of 1987, a qualitative evaluation report was published regarding the outcomes from the twenty school/college partnership curriculum enhancement projects sponsored by the California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP) between 1984 and 1987. The report was entitled Effective Relationships for School/College Partnerships: A Qualitative Evaluation of the Curriculum Enhancement Projects Participating in the California Academic Partnership Program 1984-1987. This paper: (1) describes a qualitative approach to evaluate the effectiveness of school/college partnership curriculum enhancements efforts, (2) describes the findings and recommendations of the qualitative evaluation report, and (3) assesses the impact of the evaluation report on the development of seven new school/college partnership efforts which began in the summer of 1987.

Section II of this report describes the background and methodology utilized for the partnership curriculum enhancement report. It describes the California Academic Partnership Program, the twenty curriculum enhancement partnerships between postsecondary education institutions and junior and senior high schools throughout the state of California, and it discusses the purpose and the methodology of the qualitative evaluation.

The Primary Findings of the report are outlined in Section III of this paper. The findings indicate ways in which the twenty project directors indicated that curriculum enhancement projects could best be enhanced. Specifically, the findings suggest answers to such questions as: what are those characteristics which make up an effective school/college partnership for curriculum enhancement; what is the best administrative structure to carry out this type of partnership; what are the best ways to promote postsecondary faculty working with schools, faculty on curriculum enhancement; what are the best incentives for interinstitutional cooperation; what are the best ways for postsecondary education institutions to assist schools and school districts to enhance their curriculum; what is the best way to target academic preparation efforts for underrepresented students; and what are the unintended outcomes of the partnership projects and to what extent do they enhance the ability of projects to proceed?

From these findings, summarized in Section III, recommendations were forthcoming. Section IV summarizes these recommendations on ways to enhance school/college partnerships in curriculum enhancement.

Section V describes the way in which seven new curriculum enhancement project directors assessed the extent to which the information gleaned from the report was useful/helpful to them in implementing the specific items of partnership building described

above. The data collected from a telephone interview survey of the project directors are delineated and conclusions based upon their perceptions are displayed.

In general, the new project directors found the report to be helpful and useful in their efforts to begin school/college partnership efforts. It was generally agreed that while the information was useful, the project report could be restructured to be even more helpful.

II. BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY OF THE PARTNERSHIP CURRICULUM ENHANCEMENT REPORT

The critical importance of improving the quality of students' academic preparation within elementary and secondary schools is an essential aspect of the "Nation at Risk" report issued by the United States Department of Education in 1983. This report encouraged the states to take a close look at the quality of education within their schools and to take strong measures to enhance that quality. In California a special omnibus educational reform act (Senate Bill 813) was passed in 1983. A year later, complementary legislation, in the form of California Assembly Bill 2398, was passed which put into place the California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP). This paper describes the report prepared to present a qualitative evaluation of the first twenty joint school/ college curriculum enhancement partnership projects which were funded by CAPP to improve academic preparation. The report is entitled Effective Relationships For School/College Partnerships: A Qualitative Evaluation Of The Curriculum Enhancement Projects Participating In The California Academic Partnership Program 1984 - 1987. This paper summarizes the experiences, learnings and recommendations of the partners involved in the twenty projects. These findings and recommendations suggest positive actions which can occur to enhance the curriculum through partnership kinds of efforts. Additionally this paper examines the helpfulness/usefulness of the report to the seven new (1987) CAPP project directors as they began to put their curriculum enhancement partnerships into place.

A. THE CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

The purpose of California Assembly Bill 2398 (Appendix A) is "to develop cooperative efforts to improve the academic quality of public secondary schools with the objective of improving the preparation of all students for college." This program was designed to fund model projects that prepare secondary school students for college. The majority of CAPP projects involve college and university faculty working together with high school and junior high school teachers in curriculum development, which is designed to provide students the skills and information needed to make them successful in college. These efforts address improvements in curriculum for grades 6 and above. Besides these curriculum enhancement partnership projects, the remaining CAPP projects are charged with the responsibility of developing and managing the administration of diagnostic tests in college preparatory mathematics and English composition.

CAPP was initially funded in 1984-85 for $1 million, and for each of the following two years at $1.5 million. The funds are allocated to the Trustees of the California State University for administration in cooperation with the State

Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, and the Regents of the University of California.

The CAPP curriculum enhancement projects were funded in order to enhance the academic preparation of all students for college, and especially those underrepresented in postsecondary education, by proposing and testing a variety of efforts. A mandatory aspect of these efforts include collaboration between faculty at postsecondary education institutions and teachers in secondary schools which results in improved curriculum.

B. THE CURRICULUM ENHANCEMENT PARTNERSHIP PROJECTS

There were a total of twenty curriculum enhancement partnership projects funded for the first three years of the California Academic Partnership Program. The project names and the institutions affiliated with the projects can be found in Appendix B. In addition to these twenty curriculum enhancement projects, there were three diagnostic testing projects which were also funded by CAPP, but did not participate in the qualitative evaluation reported herein.

Those projects funded represent a diversity of approaches to curriculum enhancement in a number of academic content areas. Appendix C reflects the characteristics of the CAPP projects and shows the diversity of kinds of academic content areas which were undertaken by the projects.

The insight and experience of the partners participating in these curriculum enhancements projects serve as the data base for the evaluation report.

C. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The qualitative evaluation and subsequent report were developed to serve a variety of purposes. The general purpose was to gather the collective perceptions of CAPP curriculum enhancement project partners regarding their successful and unsuccessful experiences in carrying-out CAPP curriculum enhancement projects.

Specifically, the purpose of the evaluation was to serve as the documentation of these partner perceptions in order to:

a. Provide a supplement to the CAPP quantitative evaluation report, which is to be based upon measurable outcomes of the intended project goals and objectives.

b. Serve as the basis for the California Postsecondary Education Commission's evaluator, who is charged with

doing a meta-evaluation of CAPP, to form judgments about the effectiveness of the CAPP program.

c. Provide a source of advice and guidance to new CAPP curriculum enhancement projects, which began in the summer of 1987. In addition, the report was to serve as a source of information to others interested in conducting similar partnership efforts.

d. Be a source of distribution of information regarding CAPP and its effects.

e. Add to the literature regarding intersegmental partnership efforts.

These purposes were reviewed and approved by the CAPP Advisory Board.

D. QUALITATIVE EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

1. COMMENTS ABOUT QUALITATIVE EVALUATION

Besides specific quantitative project outcome information collected from the CAPP curriculum enhancement projects, the CAPP Advisory Board sought to determine the ways in which CAPP partners implemented, and would have implemented, their projects so as to achieve the best results. This examination of the perceptions of partners was carried out through the use of a qualitative evaluation design. Schofield and Anderson (1984) describe qualitative inquiry as having the following characteristics:

"a. Is conducted in natural settings, ...
b. Utilizes the researcher as the chief 'instrument' in both data-gathering and analysis, ...
c. Emphasizes 'thick description,' that is, 'obtaining real, rich, deep,' data which illuminate every day patterns of action and meaning from the prospective of those being studied, ...
d. Tends to focus on social processes rather than primarily or exclusively on outcomes, ...
e. Employs multiple data-gathering methods, especially participant observation and interviews, and
f. Uses an inductive approach to data analysis, extracting its concepts from the mass of particular detail which constitutes the data base..." (pp. 8-9).

Miles and Huber (1984) suggest that "Qualitative data are attractive. They are a source of well-rounded, rich descriptions and explanations of processes occurring in local context" (p.21). They suggest that qualitative data analysis consists of three concurrent flows of activity, these are,

data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification.

The CAPP Advisory Board suggested a qualitative study to complement the quantitative evaluation design being carried out by an independent evaluator. The Board perceived that gleaning information from the rich experiences of partners would provide a positive adjunct to the learnings about partnership efforts in curriculum enhancement.

2. METHODOLOGY OF THE REPORT

a. The Design

The CAPP Advisory Board focused the qualitative evaluation on a series of questions, the answers to these questions they felt would provide qualitative information on the extent to which the CAPP projects were successful, and also on the best way they could be replicated by other projects. The questions were:

- What have you learned (pro and con) regarding:
  - What is the best way to realize an effective partnership?
  - What is the best administrative structure?
  - Which is the best way to promote postsecondary faculty working with secondary school faculty?
  - What are the best incentives for faculty cooperation and how can interested faculty be identified?
- What is the best way to assist schools/school districts to enhance curriculum?
- What is the best way to target academic preparation efforts for underrepresented students?
- What is the best way to evaluate the effectiveness of the project's efforts?
- What is the best way to institutionalize (continue) the partnership effort?
- What is the best way to disseminate information about the project, both within project institutions as well as to external audiences?
- What is the extent to which the CAPP Advisory Board/Director/Evaluator could be most helpful?

- What other unintended outcomes have helped or hindered the CAPP projects?

A design, which included written reports by partnership projects as well as full-day evaluation workshops, was developed to seek answers to these questions. The details of this design are found in Appendix D, entitled Plan for Evaluation Sessions, dated March 31, 1987.

b. Project Reports

Each of the CAPP partnership curriculum enhancement projects was asked to prepare a written report prior to attending the evaluation workshop session. Each of the project directors was asked to obtain information from other individuals at partner institutions regarding the specific questions listed in section 1 above.

Each of the partnership projects did respond. These written responses served two purposes. First, the responses provided a learning set for the discussion to be held at the evaluation workshop session. Second, reports provided written data from which part of the content analysis of this report was conducted.

c. Project Participant Workshops

Two full-day CAPP Qualitative Evaluation Workshop sessions were held, one in northern California and one in southern California. All but one of the active partnership projects participated in the evaluation workshops. Projects were asked to identify a team of individuals to attend one of the evaluation sessions. The team was to have at least one individual from each partner institution and was to include at least one faculty member or school teacher as well as a curriculum specialist.

To assist in gleaning information from the evaluation workshops, seven facilitators were chosen to work in small groups with the partnership individuals. These facilitators were selected from the various educational segments involved in CAPP. There were two University of California representatives, two California State University representatives, one CAL-SOAP representative, one State Department of Education representative, and one California Community College representative. These facilitators were provided with written information regarding the evaluation design and the plan for the workshop, prior to the actual session. A 1½ hour training session was held the morning before each evaluation session for the facilitators.

An agenda was developed for the evaluation sessions. The sessions were structured in the following manner. In the Opening Remarks, it was made clear that information collected during the evaluation session, as well as in the written reports, would be synthesized and only reported in an aggregate form. No specific project would be identified in the project report, nor would any individual. It was felt that this anonymity was important as it allowed partner participants to be as candid as possible.

In a plenary working session the entire group worked through the answer to one of the evaluation questions, in order to both model the way in which the interaction during the day would occur, and to get responses to the specific question. The question used at both sessions was: "What are the characteristics which enable/hinder postsecondary institutions to work effectively with schools to enhance curriculum?"

After this plenary session, the participants were divided into small groups by educational segment. That is, all of the persons from the University of California met in one group, the individuals from the California State University met in one group, etc. The priority discussion question for these "segment sessions" was: "What have you learned about effective ways of interacting with other segments in conducting a partnership project?" The purpose of this question was to determine if there were differences by segment regarding the ease or difficulty of working with the different segment partners.

After an informal lunch, the participants were convened in assigned small groups, which were both intersegmental and interproject. This division of participants was established to get interaction from different projects as well as from different segments. The facilitators were given the series of questions described in 2a above. Each facilitator received the questions in a different order so that each question would be discussed by at least one group. In actuality, the average number of questions discussed by a group was four out of eight.

After the small group discussions, a facilitator feedback panel was held to discuss some of the small group outcomes. During this discussion, participants were encouraged to add their thoughts, comments, and recommendations to the findings described by the facilitators.

d. Data and Analysis

1. Data collected

Through the above-stated activities, the following data were collected for the qualitative evaluation:

- Written reports from each of the partnership projects.
- Facilitator reports describing the discussions, remarks, comments, and outcomes of both the segment and intersegmental group sessions.
- Overview comments made by the qualitative evaluator and the CAPP Director of the general workshop proceedings, as well as of the sessions which they "floated" among.

2. Analysis

From all of the written information, a qualitative data analysis was conducted. As described by Miles and Huberman this effort would be considered a cross-site evaluation in that it reviewed data from a variety of different project sites. The specific tactics used in the content analysis of the written data included noting patterns and themes as well as clustering like items. The data responses were formatted underneath categories which were the same as the questions which the CAPP Advisory Board had raised.

Once common elements were ascertained from the data, they were placed into primary or secondary categories. Characteristics were determined to be "primary" if they were suggested by a significant number (usually over eight) of the projects. Characteristics which had fewer responses were considered secondary. Similar responses were grouped together in order to develop the findings and recommendations.

A draft of the report was submitted to the facilitators, as well as to the CAPP Director, in order to ensure that the analysis was accurate and coincided with their perceptions of the information which came out of the evaluation sessions. Each of the facilitators was given the opportunity to suggest where there were gaps in the information presented or errors in terms of the interpretation of the data.

III. PRIMARY FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The report entails 30 pages of findings gleaned from the qualitative data. The descriptions of these findings presented in this paper are edited from the report. Additionally, not all of the questions which the CAPP Advisory Board had raised are included. Those items covered include: General characteristics which contribute to effective partnerships, effective administrative structures, best ways to promote postsecondary faculty working with schools' faculty; best ways to assist schools/school districts to enhance curriculum; effective ways to promote academic preparation efforts for underrepresented students and what are potential unintended outcomes. Items not presented in this paper but which are in the report include: best ways to evaluate effectiveness of the projects, best ways to institutionalize the partnership efforts, best ways to disseminate information about partnership projects and ways in which the CAPP specific support structure could be most helpful to projects. Those items were intentionally left out because the new project directors who were interviewed for the information found in Section V had not had sufficient time to determine the usefulness of any of these items.

The cornerstone of the California Academic Partnership Program's efforts to enhance the academic preparation of students is the cultivation of partnerships between postsecondary education institutions and the schools within California's school districts. Effective collaboration between these segments of education is perceived to be the way in which curriculum could be most satisfactorily enhanced to help ensure student access to and success in postsecondary education. The qualitative evaluation focuses upon identifying the characteristics which contribute to an effective partnership. Presented below are a listing of those general characteristics as well as an in-depth analysis of two of the primary components of partnership efforts, i.e., the administrative structure and the way in which faculty-to-faculty interaction can best occur.

A. General Characteristics

The qualitative evaluation suggests that when the following general characteristics exist among partnership institutions, a successful collaboration can occur. These characteristics are:

1. The clear establishment of common goals which are recognized and developed cooperatively: One project described this common effort as "a oneness of purpose."

2. The development of mutual trust and respect among faculty: This entails the recognition of teachers as the "experts" in curricular reform.

3. The provision of sufficient time to develop and strengthen the relationships both among faculty and administrators: This includes unstructured time for faculty to get to know each other and have the time to think together in order to reach a mutual understanding of each other's contribution to the aims of the curricular enhancement effort. The importance of food as a catalyst to bring people together is also seen as an important element.

4. The quality of the individuals, both in administrative and teaching roles, who have primary responsibility for development of the partnership projects.

5. Continued and constant interaction between "top" management and the faculty directly involved in carrying out the curricular enhancement efforts: Reinforcement by top management was seen as crucial, but, at the same time, strict oversight by top management was seen to have a negative impact.

6. The willingness to recognize and understand the different cycles and languages of the various educational segments: Along these same lines, it was considered important to be flexible in dealing with the variety of institutional policies and processes.

7. Periodic formative evaluation to ensure that the kinds of activities undertaken are maximized in terms of their effectiveness in reaching commonly and mutually developed goals.

8. The need for shared responsibility and accountability among the segments.

9. Crisp lines of communication which are inclusive of individuals within project institutions rather than exclusive.

It was perceived that if these characteristics were in place an effective partnership could be realized.

In particular, two primary partnership building blocks now will be focused upon. These building blocks are: the types of administrative structures for partnerships which are most effective and the way in which faculty-to-faculty interaction can best occur.

B. Administrative Structure

An essential characteristic of effective partnerships is the way in which the partners organize to work together. The CAPP Partnership Projects were asked to identify the most effective way in which administrative structures could be developed in order to maximize the ability for partnerships to succeed. There was a variety of models of partnerships which did work, yet there were four primary characteristics which a majority of partnerships found to be most important in order to have an effective partnership. These four primary elements are: (1) the establishment of an ongoing advisory committee, (2) the development of clear expectations and goals, (3) strong communication channels, and (4) individuals identified as responsible for staffing, developing and maintaining the partnership effort.

1. Advisory committees

The primary characteristic, identified by more than three-quarters of the projects as critical for the development of a partnership that works, was the establishment of an ongoing advisory committee. One project deemed it the "cornerstone" of the partners' ability to work together. It was seen as extremely important that the advisory committee meet on a regular and continuing basis, at a minimum of every other month.

Partners recommended that a variety of types of individuals be on the committee. The necessary condition is that each partner institution be included. Additionally, the members of the committee should be either the chief executive officers (CEOs) of the respective institutions or CEO-designates with some level of decision-making responsibility.

The committee should be responsible for planning, coordinating and implementing the partnership efforts. This group, simply by meeting, encourages the continued development of partnership activities. An additional important characteristic was the ability for members to exercise some level of budgetary authority for each of the institutions. It did not seem to matter who chaired the committee, although rotating chairs was seen as beneficial.

The role of the committee member was also determined to be important. It was seen as helpful if curriculum experts as well as high school principals and representatives of the faculty of the postsecondary

institutions and secondary schools were involved. Additionally, representation of other "staff," e.g. counselors, support services staff, etc., was suggested.

2. Clear goals and expectations

The second primary principle was the importance of clarifying the expectations of each of the partner institutions and the common goals which were to be achieved. It was strongly suggested that very early in the project the expectations and roles of each of the partners be clarified through joint discussion. Included in these discussions should be: what, exactly, the partnership is trying to accomplish and time-lines indicating when specific objectives should be reached. Putting these goals in writing reinforced the clarity of the expectations. Furthermore, this activity was important for defining and delineating what each partner was accountable for, and the way in which each partner would contribute to the ongoing partnership.

A further refinement of this goal and expectation clarification is to determine the ways in which the project benefits each of the participating institutions. It was recognized by the projects that partners were involved in these efforts for their mutual benefit. While these benefits varied a great deal, it was important to make clear that each institution had a real stake in the partnership effort succeeding. Determining and making this enlightened self-interest obvious was seen as an important step in building the partnership relationship.

3. Communications about the project

The third critical element identified by partners was a strong communication network for the project. Information about the project and its implementation should be distributed to faculty members and other interested individuals; such as school board members and other members within the institution. Neglecting the communication element of partnerships was suggested as a way to ensure the failure of the partnership effort. One obvious communication tool was the frequent advisory committee meeting. It was suggested that open sessions of the advisory committee meetings should be held so that broad participation could occur. The extent to which communication about the partnership efforts was made known to the involved educational communities, especially within the school district, was seen to reduce anxiety about the partnership effort. Such

communication efforts should be thought out and carried out by all of the partner institutions.

4. Identified responsible persons

The final primary structural element recognized by partners is the identification of responsible persons at each institution to direct the partnership. It was suggested that there be only one project director or coordinator, or whatever title is appropriate, for the partnership effort. However, it was seen as essential that each partner institution have an assistant director/coordinator/etc., so that there would be a linking of individuals responsible for the partnership's efforts. It was also suggested that the director and assistant directors be persons who have a strong interest in these activities and who have the skills and authority to get things done. The CAPP partners indicated that the appropriate role of these individuals be perceived as that of "diplomats."

It did not seem to matter which segment housed the director, but simply that the individual would have the time and the ability to get things done. A further argument for having assistant directors at each of the institutions was that this allowed the partnership to be less dependent upon one individual, especially if that individual should leave.

It was considered important that the individuals responsible for coordinating the project have their responsibilities indicated as part of their job descriptions. Furthermore, recognizing that these efforts take an enormous amount of personal time, it was suggested that somewhere between a 40% and full-time project director be designated to implement the project.

C. Faculty-To-Faculty Interaction

The items which follow provide an approach that postsecondary faculty and secondary school faculty can use to develop the partnership relationship among themselves in order to carry out the actual implementation of curriculum enhancement. There are four primary characteristics distinguishable incentives, faculty gatherings, the identification of key faculty, and professionalization of the activities.

1. Distinguishable incentives

By far the most critical element reported that supports the development of faculty-to-faculty interaction was

the incentives provided for involvement. While it was important to recognize the mutual benefits which faculty gained from these development efforts, a clearly visible reward and recognition system was seen as necessary.

The most significant factor incentive for stimulating faculty-to-faculty interaction was the stipend. The appropriate amount for a stipend seems to be about what school districts have established for curriculum development rates. This tended to be somewhere between $700 and $1,000 per year.

The second most commonly cited incentive was release classroom time. It is imperative that secondary school faculty have the opportunity to participate in these curriculum enhancement activities, as part of their staff development. This means that they need time away from the classroom and that appropriate substitute faculty be provided. For postsecondary faculty, especially community college faculty, the incentive needed to be release time from other duties. Often the ability to find a mutual time when faculty could be released from the different institutions was a problem.

The next most often suggested incentive was bringing faculty together at different sites. These visits to other campuses, where in-service training, curriculum and instructional assistance were carried out, was an important incentive. Another incentive identified by faculty was involvement in summer programs. This was seen as especially powerful when faculty could be brought together for even as few as three or four days in the summer to discuss curriculum issues. Yet another incentive was the provision of special perks, such as postsecondary institution library cards, access to special events, etc.

While a variety of incentives were commented upon, the important thing is to identify and make available incentives for those faculty involved in the curriculum effort. Partners do not see it as reasonable to expect faculty to participate only out of their personal concern for these efforts.

2. Faculty gatherings

The second most frequently cited way to encourage faculty-to-faculty interaction was the use of faculty gatherings. These may include such formats as forums and retreats. Bringing the faculty together in sufficiently small groups to be able to discuss common areas of interest was especially effective. This needs

to be done not just once, but consistently over a period of time to be effective.

A commonly mentioned and strongly supported component of these get-togethers was the availability of food. It was described over and over again that luncheons and snacks go a long way toward bringing people together. Faculty themselves described the importance of "getting away and breaking bread together." This did not seem to require anything elaborate, but simply an opportunity to have sufficient informal time to get to know each other.

Within these faculty forums it was recognized as important to avoid a common stereotype held by many secondary faculty, and that was the "elitist" nature of the postsecondary faculty. Comments garnered by the evaluation made it clear that the "intellectual arrogance" of postsecondary faculty could severely hinder the project. It was incumbent upon postsecondary faculty to break down the barriers erected upon that perception and thus, to ensure the ability to work with secondary faculty on curriculum issues. Partnerships were most successful when postsecondary faculty recognized that "the best teacher of teachers is a fellow teacher," and also that teachers are "the curriculum experts." One suggestion to overcome this dilemma was having early discussions between postsecondary and secondary faculty on the common purposes of the efforts and to discuss what each faculty member sees as important about the project. The professionalization of these discussions was seen as a most critical factor.

3. Identification of key faculty

The third primary element in strengthening faculty-to-faculty interaction was the early identification of "key" faculty at both postsecondary and secondary institutions. These faculty should be carefully selected for their leadership qualities and their legitimate interest in the partnership purpose. It was suggested by many partnership institutions that having such individuals begin the project lends a great deal of credibility to the partnership effort. Providing these individuals with clearly defined responsibilities and appropriate staff support to carry them out was cited as very important. It was also important, that the activities suggested by the faculty be carried out. This ability to follow-up, mainly through the dedication of staff support to the faculty interaction, is again one of the critical ingredients in ensuring that effective partnerships actually occur.

4. Professionalization of the activities

The final characteristic seen as primary by the projects was the reinforcement, in whatever way possible, of the professional nature of these activities. Built into these efforts must be a strong recognition of the role of the teacher as curriculum expert. Additionally, the professional contributions faculty are making at their individual institutions, and as model curriculum projects which can be replicated by others, must be acknowledged.

These four characteristics were determined to be those most responsible for promoting positive faculty-to-faculty interaction. The three other characteristics stated are: understanding institutional protocol, utilizing research opportunities, and clarifying expectations.

D. SUCCESSFUL WAYS TO ACHIEVE CURRICULUM ENHANCEMENT

The CAPP projects had as their main goal enhancing curriculum in order to achieve better academic preparation of students interested in pursuing postsecondary education. The characteristics previously described set forth ways in which administrators and faculty can build partnership relationships to work together. This section deals with specific ways curriculum enhancement was seen to be most successfully achieved. There were two primary ways in which curriculum enhancement most appropriately occurred, as well as a number of secondary characteristics. The two primary characteristics discussed below include meeting the needs of the schools and faculty working together in support groups. Those elements seen as less essential but still helpful include: involving the right set of individuals, clarifying the importance of consistent curricular connections, utilizing successful models of curriculum enhancement, targeting resources, ensuring the flexibility of the approaches, and assessing the potential impact of the external environment on these efforts.

1. Meeting the Needs of the Schools

If successful curriculum enhancement is to occur, CAPP partners strongly suggest that the approaches must attack specific, readily identifiable areas of need within the school district. The determination of these needs must be made by the school district. While this may seem obvious, it was vitally important. The schools had to be meeting their needs versus postsecondary institutions using the schools as a research project for particular studies.

Over time, within the partnerships where success occurred,

districts came to realize that they had an extremely valuable resource in postsecondary institutions willing to work with them on specific curriculum enhancement projects. Secondary schools saw these efforts not as an intrusion, but, in fact, as an invaluable resource to enhance the way they could provide an effective curriculum for their students. Once again, it was not only important for the district to determine the needs, but, additionally, for these needs to be clearly recognized and communicated throughout the district and in its schools.

2. **Faculty Working as a Support Group**

The second element seen as primary in assisting school districts to enhance curricula is the development of faculty support groups based upon the assumption that school faculty members are the curricular experts. This concept of faculty working with faculty to enhance curricula was, of course, one of the fundamental concepts which stimulated the adoption of CAPP and its programmatic elements.

One CAPP project, describing the importance of the support group mechanism in promoting lasting change, reported, "Only if teachers feel the need, and experience encouragement for their efforts, will what goes on behind the classroom door be enhanced or significantly changed in a lasting way. Mandating change is definitely not the way to get anything accomplished. Rather the idea of faculty working with faculty supports the ability to actually enhance curricula." Another project suggested the importance of the interaction of postsecondary and secondary institutions in this way, "Multi-institutional involvement gives diversity, helping us and them to better understand each other."

Along with this notion of the support group function is the way in which faculty must necessarily be responsible for the essential outcomes of the effort. This was indicated with a project reporting that change will only occur when "it empowers those who participate in the change. The curriculum must be, in a sense, newly developed by each group of teachers who will teach it."

E. Promoting Academic Preparation Efforts for Underrepresented Students

The legislative intent of CAPP is to enhance the ability of all students, but most specifically underrepresented students, to be more academically prepared for postsecondary education. This preparation would allow them better access to, as well as success in, postsecondary institutions. Selection criteria for the partnership projects targeted geographical areas where large

numbers of underrepresented students could be served. Therefore, part of the question regarding how underrepresented students could be involved was already answered through the CAPP selection process of the school districts. There were three primary ways reported by the projects on how best to involve underrepresented students. The three primary ways include special tutoring, parental involvement, and summer programs.

1. Specialized tutoring

Projects found involvement of underrepresented students to be most effective when special tutoring efforts were established. They discovered that, when done appropriately, tutoring complimented the curriculum changes and built self-confidence among underrepresented students. If the tutoring was provided by other underrepresented students, an additional benefit was achieved by providing successful role models for the targeted student population. Along these same lines, it was discovered that small group tutoring was much more effective than individual one-on-one tutoring.

A problem was identified in assigning students to the tutoring groups if limited resources existed. Projects suggested that the best way to remedy this was to randomly select students. This gave an opportunity for all students to participate and avoided the concept of putting students into "tracks," which most projects saw as extremely debilitating to the academic success of underrepresented students.

2. Parental involvement

Projects indicated that the involvement of parents was extremely critical to enhancing the accomplishments of the underrepresented students involved. If parents were well informed about students' needs as well as sensitive to the project's efforts, they made a positive contribution to the overall success of the project. Additionally, some projects indicated it was worthwhile to involve community members and community associations to support these special efforts. It was suggested that project advisory committees look for additional resources from the local community to support their curriculum enhancement efforts.

3. Summer programs

The third primary enhancement strategy to serve underrepresented students was providing summer programs for these students. Some projects indicated that these programs were most successful when the students could reside at the postsecondary institutions; others found that the summer programs were most successful as commuter programs at the

local community college. The important factors were having an intensive summer academic effort and bringing the student to the postsecondary site.

Besides these three primary elements for assisting the targeted underrepresented groups, a variety of other factors were discovered. These include: enhanced self-image, perceptions of students who succeed, focus on critical college preparation courses, coordination with other underrepresented student efforts, utilization of college role models, transitional courses between sixth and seventh grade, teacher referrals, counselor referrals, attractiveness of project, and raising the consciousness regarding underrepresented students' needs.

F. THE UNEXPECTED: UNINTENDED PROJECT OUTCOMES

One of the strengths of the qualitative research design was the ability to gather from the partnership participants those outcomes which were an unintended, unexpected part of the project. There were numerous such outcomes, and it was interesting to note that six of the unintended outcomes were experienced by a majority of the participants. An additional twenty unintended outcomes were also described by participants. The extent to which these partnership projects have led to other, mostly positive, consequences in the postsecondary and secondary institutions which were involved, is evidence that this kind of effort can have significant impact on educational institutions, and, potentially, on the entire educational system.

- **Primary Unintended Outcomes**

  Below are those primary unintended outcomes listed by a majority of the partner projects.

  a. A majority of the projects indicated that they did not anticipate the extent to which postsecondary faculty would become aware of the curricular and instructional strategies utilized by the junior high school and the high school faculty. Postsecondary faculty were appreciative of the extent to which teachers are truly committed to enhancing the educational outcomes of their students. The efforts reinforced the concept of teacher as leader within the school. As one project stated, "there was a true appreciation for each other as an outcome of these efforts."

  b. Another primary unintended outcome was the degree to which information was shared by CAPP-involved faculty with other faculty not directly involved in the project. Teachers who were not involved directly in the partnership project were influenced by those who were

involved. Additionally, most projects indicated that more teachers than expected were involved.

c. Both postsecondary and secondary faculty and administrators indicated that an extremely positive outcome was the good friendships and professional respect which developed among colleagues. The partnership efforts truly led to a break down of the "we/they" mode of thinking about individuals in different educational segments.

d. Another unintended outcome was the degree to which collaboration occurred between project faculty and student services in place at the schools. It was reported that a number of student services which were initiated to support the partnership effort, led to institutionalization of those efforts on an ongoing basis.

e. Another strong outcome was the degree to which these projects led to curricular enhancement in other subject areas than had originally been planned. Individuals who became involved in one area of curriculum enhancement used what was learned and transferred it to other areas. This was also seen as materials, which were developed for specific projects, found their way into other curricula by involved faculty.

f. The final primary outcome was the extent to which underrepresented students were, in fact, influenced. It was the observation of many that underrepresented students were much more willing to discuss their ability to "go to college." There was the perception that, indeed, the students' self-image had been improved, and, on the other side of the coin, faculty perceptions of underrepresented students had been positively affected.

IV. PRIMARY RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STUDY

Based on the FINDINGS the report suggested a series of recommendations which could be made about the various aspects of partnership approaches to educational excellence as reviewed through the qualitative evaluation. Those items listed below as primary recommendations reflect the consensus of many of the CAPP projects.

A. CHARACTERISTICS WHICH CONTRIBUTE TO EFFECTIVE PARTNERSHIPS

1. General Characteristics

It is recommended that partnerships wishing to succeed contain as many of the characteristics suggested below as possible.

a. The clear establishment of common goals which are recognized and developed together. One project described this common effort as the generation of "a oneness of purpose."

b. The development of mutual trust and respect among faculty: This entails the recognition of teachers as the "experts" in curricular reform.

c. The provision of sufficient time to develop and strengthen the relationships both among faculty and administrators: This includes unstructured time for faculty to get to know each other and have the time to think together in order to reach a mutual understanding of each other's contribution to the aims of the curricular enhancement effort. Food as a catalyst in bringing people together is seen as an important element.

d. The quality and commitment of the individuals, both in administrative and teaching roles, who have primary responsibility for development of the partnership project is important.

e. Continued and constant interaction between "top" management and the faculty directly involved in carrying out the curricular enhancement effort: Reinforcement by top management was seen as crucial, but, at the same time, strict oversight by top management was seen to have a negative impact.

f. The willingness to recognize and understand the different cycles and languages of the various educational segments: It was considered important to be flexible in dealing with the variety of

institutional policies and processes.

g. Periodic formative evaluation to ensure that the kinds of activities undertaken are maximized in terms of their effectiveness in reaching commonly and mutually developed goals.

h. The need for shared responsibility and accountability among the segments.

i. Crisp lines of communication which are inclusive of individuals within project institutions rather than exclusive.

2. **Administrative Structures**

- Primary recommendations

1. Develop an advisory committee with the following characteristics:

a. Representatives from each institution;

b. Committee should meet frequently, no less than every other month;

c. Membership should include:

- Chief Executive Officer or Designee with some level of decision-making and budgetary authority,

- Curriculum experts, and

- Faculty from each institution;

d. The committee should see as its role providing direction for planning, implementating, coordinating, communicating about, resource development and utilization, and periodic formative evaluation of the project;

e. The chair of the committee should be rotated among institutions; and

f. Projects should ensure that each institution has some clear responsibilities and authority for the conduct of the project.

2. Clarify goals and expectations

   a. Partners should clarify specifically what it is the project is attempting to accomplish;

   b. Specific goals and objectives should be developed by the partners together and written down;

   c. The specific benefits each segment will realize out of the project should be enumerated;

   d. Expectations should be clearly identified for each institution's responsibility and accountability; and

   e. The way in which decision-making will occur should be articulated.

3. Communicate

   - Ways should be devised for the advisory committee to inform those within the partner institutions, as well as the school board, of what is occurring. Ways to accomplish this are:

     - Minutes of advisory committee meetings should be broadly circulated, as should materials generated by the project; and

     - Occasional open sessions of the advisory committee should be held at different project sites, especially high school sites.

4. Identify responsible persons

   a. There should be one project director who spends at least 40% time managing the project:

      - Responsibilities of project director should be clarified in the person's job description and not be considered as an added responsibility, and

- It does not matter which segment the project director is housed.

b. There should be one assistant director at each institutional site, whose responsibilities are stated in the individuals' job descriptions; and

c. The fiscal agent for the project should be the institution which has the ability to utilize the funds as projected with the fewest fiscal restraints.

3. Faculty-to-Faculty Interaction

Recommendations on how best to achieve an effective, collegial faculty-to-faculty environment follow:

- Primary recommendations

1. Establish incentives

a. The most effective incentive is the stipend, approximately $700 to $1,000 per year seems appropriate as based upon curriculum development rates within the district;

b. Provide release time to participate. This is for both secondary as well as postsecondary participants;

c. Provide summer opportunities for faculty-to-faculty enrichment;

d. Provide special perks for secondary faculty, e.g., postsecondary library cards, access to special events, etc.; and

e. Ensure recognition for involvement in project efforts.

2. Plan faculty gatherings to bring postsecondary and secondary faculty together

a. Ensure these are often enough to make a difference, at least once every other month;

b. Provide sufficient time to establish rapport and break down barriers;

c. Ensure that initial gatherings are structured

enough to provide presentations by both secondary and postsecondary faculty to help build a sense of professionalism for all involved;

d. When possible, provide food;

e. Include an early discussion of the general purpose of the project and the mutual benefits derived from faculty involvement; and

f. Ensure appropriate staff support to follow-up on activities so that progress can be made.

3. Identify "key" faculty in secondary and postsecondary institutions.

4. Ensure that meetings are conducted on a "professional" level.

- Use as basic assumptions:

  - Teachers are the curriculum experts, and

  - Teachers are the best persons to teach other teachers.

B. SUCCESSFUL WAYS TO ACHIEVE CURRICULUM ENHANCEMENT

Partner projects recommended these primary and secondary ways to enhance the curriculum at the school sites.

- Primary Recommendations

a. Clarify, focus on and meet the needs as determined by the schools/school district.

1. The curriculum enhancement efforts cannot be imposed on the schools by the postsecondary institution.

2. Clearly identify the negative consequences of not responding to the needs as identified by the district, and how these consequences impact both secondary and postsecondary faculty.

b. Establish a support group setting for postsecondary faculty to work with secondary faculty.

1. Faculty, working together in teams, must be empowered to develop the curriculum enhancement changes.

2. A way of proceeding is to work through the existing curriculum and to identify gaps and overlaps, resulting in recommendations which establish the needed connections between secondary and postsecondary curriculum.

3. These faculty groups need to be provided the kind of support structure wherein "risk-taking" can occur.

C. PROMOTING ACADEMIC PREPARATION EFFORTS FOR UNDERREPRESENTED STUDENTS

- Primary recommendations

1. Include a complementary tutoring component as the most powerful way to support curricular change efforts for underrepresented students.

   a. Tutoring developed underrepresented students' self-esteem and confidence;

   b. Tutoring components provided an opportunity for successful underrepresented students to serve as tutors and role-models to younger students; and

   c. Tutoring was best implemented in small groups so that peer group learning could occur.

2. Involve parents in change efforts. When possible, bring parents on site to understand the importance of curricular connections and college preparatory courses.

3. Provide summer academic skill-building programs as part of efforts.

   a. Residential summer programs are preferred, although commuting to local community colleges was also effective;

   b. Utilization of postsecondary science laboratories was especially helpful to motivate students in science; and

   c. Explore the possibility of providing summer programs for junior high school students prior to matriculation to high school.

D. THE UNEXPECTED: UNINTENDED PROJECT OUTCOMES

The unintended outcomes experienced by CAPP partner projects lend themselves to recommendations for more effective partnership efforts.

1. Deliberately consider ways for involved faculty to transfer their focused curriculum development activities to other curriculum outside the project boundaries.

2. Faculty involved in the project should determine ways to work with faculty not involved in the project.

3. Determine ways to involve the existing student support services at both high school and junior high school campuses to support curriculum efforts.

4. Be prepared for the significant amount of effort necessary to carry out the partnership project.

5. Think through the ways in which more institutions can become involved.

6. Determine the ways in which clarification of students' career goals can be incorporated into the curriculum enhancement effort.

7. Plan to utilize the enhanced curricular content for training of substitute and temporary teachers.

8. Consider ways in which curriculum linkages between junior high school, high school, and postsecondary education can occur.

9. Bring high school and postsecondary institution counselors together to discuss ways in which they can support the project.

10. Consider ways to involve the corporate sector to support the project.

V. ASSESSING THE USEFULNESS/HELPFULNESS OF THE SCHOOL/COLLEGE PARTNERSHIP REPORT

Sections II, III, and IV describe the report which contained the findings and recommendations of a qualitative evaluation of twenty school/college partnership curriculum enhancement projects. As previously stated, one of the purposes of the report was to provide a source of advice and guidance to the new CAPP curriculum enhancement projects, which began in the summer of 1987. In addition, the report was to serve as a source of information to others interested in conducting similar partnership efforts.

This section of the paper deals with the purpose of the report cited above. That is, what, if any, was the impact of the report on the initial development of the seven new CAPP school/college partnership efforts that began in the summer 1987. While the findings from the qualitative evaluation accurately reflect the perspectives of the 1984-87 partnerships project, the report is only "useful" if newly developing projects can be enhanced by using the information and advice presented.

A. Method of Assessing Impact

The design and analysis used to assess the report's usefulness is described below.

1. Design

The School/College report was completed in June 1987 and published in September 1987. The publication coincided with workshops held by the CAPP Statewide Executive Director for the seven new project directors. At the workshops, the report was distributed, and many items from the report were referred to or used as workshop topics. New project directors were encouraged to utilize the report as a guide during the development of their partnership efforts.

Approximately six months after the Fall workshop, a letter and survey were sent to each of the seven project directors. The letter and survey are attached as Appendix E. The letter indicated the purpose of the survey. It also explained that the survey form would be used as the format for a telephone interview.

In two cases, two individuals were designated as project co-directors. In these circumstances a note was placed on each of the co-directors' letters indicating which of the two had been selected for the telephone interview. An offer was made to switch interviewees if the non-selected co-director would be more appropriately contacted. In neither case was this offer taken.

Six of the seven project directors agreed to discuss the report through the telephone survey. One director indicated s/he did not use the report, nor was the person planning to do so in the near future.

The author conducted all six of the telephone surveys. The average time spent on an interview was approximately 40 minutes. In all cases the survey form was utilized as the guide for questioning, and each question was covered. Although every item was discussed, because of the interrelationship of the items, the interview often skipped from item to item in a random fashion. Project directors were not asked to complete the survey in writing; therefore, no surveys have been collected.

At the beginning of each interview the author reiterated the purpose of the survey and of the interview. In addition, the author pledged complete confidentiality regarding everything that was discussed during the interview. Project directors were informed that the information would only be reported in the aggregate and that no information would be shared which would allow the project or the director to be identified with any specific comment. Directors were informed, however, that statements such as: "One project director said..." would likely be used. Three of the directors indicated no concern about being identified with their comments. Even so, this report reflects the level of confidentiality and anonymity described above.

2. Analysis

The method of analysis for this paper is a cross-site content analysis. It is cross-site in that the data are reviewed from similar yet distinct projects. Additionally, the analysis conducted of the new project directors' responses, similar to the analysis conducted in the School/College Partnership report, includes noting patterns and themes as well as clustering like items. The clustered items are categorized by survey item. When a categorized item did not fit under a specific survey item, it was placed under a broad-based item entitled "general comments."

It was discovered during the interviews that an appropriate category was left out of the survey questionnaire. The three categories represented in the survey are "Very Helpful," "Helpful," and "Not Helpful." During the first interview, it became clear that a fourth category should have been added to each of the questions in the survey. That item should have been

"Not Used." Therefore, the results include responses for the three categories indicated on the survey, and, when appropriate, "Not Used" is specified as well.

The analysis led to the descriptions found in Section B "Findings" and Section C "Conclusions" described below. Each comment under the specific survey item is listed if the frequency of response was more than one or if an individual item made a specific salient point about the report or about effective partnerships, as determined by the author. When items are listed because of the frequency of their occurance, the frequency is indicated in parentheses after the item.

B. FINDINGS

The following are extracted from the surveys, which were completed by interview over the telephone, of the new CAPP project directors. The Findings are presented in the order that they appear on the survey, and also the information is presented both by categories, whether that be Very Helpful-Helpful-Not Helpful or the additional category which was subsequently added of Not Used, and followed by specific comments of the respondents. The comments are paraphrased and listed in the order of frequency with which they were mentioned by project directors. The number of directors responding to each item is indicated in parentheses at the end of each comment.

The first item asked was whether or not the project director had, in fact, read the report. Four of the project directors had read all of it while two had read parts of it. One project director had not read the report and did not wish to participate in the survey. Therefore, the results of this "usefulness" survey are dependent upon six of the seven new CAPP project directors.

1. The next question asked: "Were the nine characteristics which were found to contribute to effective partnerships helpful to you in establishing your partnership?" These nine characteristics can be found in section IV A. 1. of this paper. Two of the project directors indicated that the nine characteristics were Very Helpful, while four indicated Helpful. The comments which the project directors made were as follows:

   a. All of the characteristics made sense; they helped to validate what it was we were doing, and they helped alleviate frustration in terms of the difficult nature of establishing partnerships. (5)

   b. The most important aspect stated was encouraging us

to set goals. (3)

c. The characteristics were useful as a sounding board to test whether or not we were on the right track. (2)

d. The most important aspect was recognizing that it takes time to build significant partnerships. (2)

e. It is important to understand the need for both formal and informal communications. (2)

f. While the characteristics were useful, our project is still struggling with the covert problem created by the stereotyping of the elite postsecondary faculty and non-elite secondary faculty.

g. I found the characteristics most helpful when they were accompanied with specific "how tos."

2. The next question asked: "Was the report useful in forming the administrative structure of the partnership?" One of the project directors found it Very Helpful, while the remaining five found this aspect of the report Helpful. Comments were as follows:

   a. We have established an extremely strong advisory board, and it pays off. It meets regularly, and the peer pressure among board members to have a successful project has been most helpful. (5)

   b. The section dealing with the importance of having an individual dedicated to coordinate the project, to be the hero, was very useful. (3)

   c. We found the section regarding the importance of involving teaching faculty as well as top administrators to be a critical component of the composition of our board. (2)

   d. It was useful to think through the most flexible fiscal structure of the project as we began. (2)

3. The third item asked if the report was useful in promoting interaction between postsecondary faculty and schools faculty. Of the six project directors who responded, two indicated that it was Very Helpful, three Helpful, and one did not use this section. Comments emanating from project directors about this aspect included:

   a. We found the information about building trust

especially useful. (3)

b. Appreciated the strong suggestions about utilizing social time and food as an informal way for faculty to break down the barriers between them, as an important aspect of the success of our project. (2)

c. Appreciated the points about involving faculty interested in these areas from the beginning. One project indicated they did not, and it had created difficulties. The other project reinforced the idea of how a dedicated faculty core could substantially promote a partnership project. (2)

d. This section helped guide us in increasing our awareness of how different segments of education worked. (2)

4. The fourth item explored the extent to which the discussion in the report regarding incentives for interinstitutional cooperation was useful. Of the project directors, one found this section Very Helpful, four Helpful, and one did not use it. Comments from the project directors were:

a. It was extremely important for us to identify stipends as the incentive for the teachers. It was also useful for us to look at the variety of options which might best meet teacher and faculty needs. The report helped us discover that different incentives for faculty from different segments made sense. We also found the suggestion regarding the importance of paying postsecondary and school faculty the same amount was extremely important. (4)

b. The report helped us reinforce and make clear that a fundamental assumption of the project must be "teacher as expert." (3)

c. The report helped reinforce the ongoing need for recognition of those involved in partnership efforts. (2)

d. The report helped suggest to us the utilization of student teachers working with students in the school district. This was not part of our original proposal, yet we found it to be very effective. (2)

e. Plan to hold summer retreat for all involved

faculty as a way to bring them more closely together. (2)

5. Assisting postsecondary institutions and schools to collaborate to enhance curriculum is an important aspect of the CAPP effort. This item in the report was seen as less useful than others in the report. Four project directors found it Helpful, one Not Helpful, and one Not Used. The comments by the project directors include:

   a. This section was helpful in identifying that there were many different ways to reach effective curriculum enhancement, and it encouraged us to explore our method of approach. We found it most useful to have faculty brainstorm the different ways in which curriculum enhancement could occur. (3)

   b. While the general statements in this section were all right. There were insufficient examples of how to apply the recommendations directly. There needed to be more specificity in this section.

6. An important aspect of the CAPP effort was to involve underrepresented students in its intended outcomes of increased academic preparation and college participation. The report described ways to involve underrepresented students. One project director found this section Very Helpful, four Helpful, and one Not Helpful. Comments by the project directors include:

   a. After reviewing the report, we built a strong parent component into our efforts. In fact, one project had faculty personally telephone parents regarding the importance of mathematics in their child's education. (3)

   b. The recommendations on a tutoring component were very good. We have included a tutoring component in our program. (2)

   c. The report encouraged us to involve community members with our project. (2)

   d. The fact of the emphasis on underrepresented students helped to put pressure on the project to ensure that we responded to this important criterion. (2)

   e. Found the suggestions most helpful in targeting our efforts.

7. The original CAPP project directors, while indicating their intended results, also described their unintended outcomes. These were listed in the report. The new project directors were asked the extent to which these were helpful as they proceeded in developing their partnership efforts. Five of the project directors found this section useful, while one had not utilized this section. No two project directors had similar comments. Therefore, all of the below are comments from individual project directors.

   a. This section led to an awareness on the part of our advisory board - on the way in which we could "broker" other institutions to become involved in our effort.

   b. Served as a stimulus for us to discuss different approaches to curriculum reform within the same project. We realized it was all right to have different academic disciplines approach curriculum reform in different ways.

   c. Found that the interaction between the school of education faculty and discipline faculty at the postsecondary institution was new and most productive. (This was also an unintended outcome of the original CAPP projects.)

   d. Unfortunately, it led postsecondary faculty to feel that the problems faced by teachers in the schools were hopeless. While it enhanced their appreciation of the teachers' role, postsecondary faculty considered the problems to be tremendously complex and difficult to resolve.

   e. Helped, again, to take into consideration how long it takes to build partnerships. These kinds of efforts were much slower than anticipated, and it was good to see that others had the same experience.

   f. One project is using an original CAPP project's national recognition as a goal for its own efforts.

   g. Already procured another grant based on its CAPP selection.

8. Overall review of the report. Project directors were asked, in general, how they viewed the report. Four indicated it was Very Helpful, and two indicated that it was Helpful. General comments about the report included:

a. Found it to be useful over time. Referred to it frequently, and learned new things each time it was read. (3)

b. By reading it early in the project, the report strongly influenced the way in which we planned our effort. (2)

c. Realized through the report the importance of the CAPP project as a broker for all of the variety of school reform efforts underway. The report helped us see CAPP as a "prism" which, on one hand, focused a variety of efforts and, at the same time, concentrated on a single goal. (2)

d. Shared the report with individuals at each partnership site. (2)

e. Strongly validated the approach which we were taking. One project director stated that the faculty accused the director of reading the report before writing the grant to CAPP. (2)

f. Validated our effort because it was consistent with educational theory, evaluation theory, and partnership theory. (2)

g. Would have preferred more specific examples, more "how to." (2)

h. Found sections on Findings and Recommendations much too repetitive. (2)

i. Stimulated an interest in our own internal evaluation and research efforts. One project director indicated that the new project would be doing an internal qualitative evaluation. (2)

j. It was recommended that sections be added to the report which focused on organizational change and change efforts and include a change theory bibliography as well.

k. One project director subdivided the report for use by different constituents.

9. The final item asked whether or not the directors would recommend a qualitative evaluation be held of their current CAPP projects. Overwhelmingly all six of the project directors indicated yes.

C. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the Findings indicated in section B, the following conclusions can be drawn. It must be noted that these conclusions are based upon six of the seven current CAPP project directors and upon the extent to which the report and the advice in the report was useful to them.

1. The report appeared to be useful and helpful. It seemed to be especially helpful when used in an ongoing way as a formative evaluation tool.

2. The report needs to be reworked so that it can be more easily utilized. Recommendations for this reworking include a synthesis of the recommendations as well as a section on change theory and organizational development.

3. There is a need to specify as much as possible when providing information in such reports. The more specific information, the more useful it was.

4. Qualitative evaluation, performed on an ongoing basis, is seen as a useful tool for the managers of such projects.

5. The telephone calls to the project directors by which the survey for this paper was conducted served a number of broad purposes. In addition to collecting the data for this report it also tended to reinforce the status of the project. Also the author was able to provide information on the experiences of the CAPP projects as well as personal experiences related to partnership efforts. Such a mini-qualitative evaluation would be a useful tool for managing statewide projects.

6. For the most part, projects were doing many of the obvious things. The report assisted them in fine tuning and complementing their efforts.

7. It is important to continue reinforcing individuals involved in partnership kinds of efforts. Partnerships take a long time and, like other relationships, are difficult and change continually. The report tended to provide such reinforcement.

8. There is a need for curriculum reform efforts to have built into them knowledge and skill building in change theory. Many of the problems faced by such projects can be clarified and controlled by understanding how organizational change occurs.

VI. REFERENCES

Galligani, D.J. Effective Relationships for School/College Partnerships: A Qualitative Evaluation of the Curriculum Enhancement Projects Participating in the California Academic Partnership Program 1984-1987. Long Beach, CA: California State University; 1987.

Miles, M.B. and A.M. Huberman. Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook of New Methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications; 1984.

Schofield, J.W. and K.M. Anderson. Combining Quantitative and Qualitative Methods in Research on Ethnic Identity and Intergroup Relations. Paper presented at the Society for Research on Child Development-Study Group on Ethnic Socialization, Los Angeles; January, 1984.

VII. APPENDICES

A. California Assembly Bill 2398

B. List of CAPP Curriculum Development Projects 1984-87

C. Characteristics of the California Academic Partnership Program Projects.

D. Plan for Evaluation Sessions

E. Letter and Survey (with Frequencies) to New Project Directors

APPENDIX A.

Assembly Bill 2398

Assembly Bill No. 2398

CHAPTER 620

An act to amend Sections 11000, 11001, 11002, 11003, 11004, and 11005 of the Education Code, relating to schools, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

[Approved by Governor August 14, 1984. Filed with Secretary of State August 15, 1984.]

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 2398, Hughes. California Academic Partnership Program.

Existing law authorizes the establishment of the California Academic Partnership Program, to be administered by the Trustees of the California State University for the purpose of providing academic and counseling services to pupils enrolled in grades 7 to 12, inclusive, and to increase the involvement of postsecondary educational institutions to improve the academic quality of public postsecondary schools. Existing law prescribes procedures for the establishment of an advisory committee for the purpose of making recommendations to the Chancellor of the California State University for the award of grants to projects submitted by qualified applicants in accordance with prescribed criteria to implement these provisions of existing law.

This bill would make substantial revisions to the provisions of existing law governing the administration of the California Academic Partnership Program.

This bill would require the program to be administered by the Trustees of the California State University, in cooperation with the Regents of the University of California, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, and the Superintendent of Public Instruction. This bill would state that the purpose of the program is to develop cooperative efforts to improve the academic quality of the public secondary schools with the objective of improving the preparation of all students for college. This bill would specify that projects funded under the provisions of this bill may address improvements in secondary school curriculum and the ability of students to benefit from these improvements.

This bill would revise the provisions of existing law governing the composition of the advisory committee appointed to assist in the selection of proposals to be funded and the development of criteria for project evaluation, as prescribed. This bill would require the advisory committee to make recommendations regarding the development of criteria for identifying projects which are ineffective, and for the development of options identifying additional resources and efforts which promote the objectives of the program.

This bill would substantially revise eligibility criteria for the submission of funding for a project grant, as prescribed. This bill would require each project receiving a grant to provide matching funds, rather than an equal dollar amount of matching funds, from existing funds received from federal, state, local, or private sources. This bill would revise the priorities for the award of project grants.

This bill would require the Chancellor of the California State University, with the assistance of the advisory committee, and the advice of faculty from appropriate disciplines, to establish a voluntary cooperative program for the academic assessment of secondary school students in the state, as prescribed.

This bill would require the California Postsecondary Education Commission to provide a progress report on the effectiveness of the California Academic Partnership Program to the Legislature on or before January 1, 1986, and would require the commission to submit a final evaluation on or before January 1, 1988, as prescribed, and would authorize the commission to identify projects which are ineffective or not cost-effective for termination.

This bill would take effect immediately as an urgency statute.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 11000 of the Education Code is amended to read:

11000. There is hereby established the California Academic Partnership Program, to be administered by the Trustees of the California State University, in cooperation with the Regents of the University of California, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, and the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The purpose of the program shall be to develop cooperative efforts to improve the academic quality of public secondary schools with the objective of improving the preparation of all students for college. Projects funded under the provisions of this chapter may address improvements in secondary school curriculum and the ability of students to benefit from these improvements. Academic partnership projects shall be distributed throughout the state in order to provide schools located in rural, urban, and suburban areas with access to these services.

SEC. 2. Section 11001 of the Education Code is amended to read:

11001. The Chancellor of the California State University shall establish an advisory committee to assist in selecting proposals to be funded and developing criteria for project evaluation. The committee shall be composed of the following members:

(a) Two certificated secondary school teachers, including at least one junior high or intermediate school teacher, appointed by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

(b) Two certificated secondary school employees with responsibility for curriculum administration, appointed by the

Superintendent of Public Instruction.

(c) One director of a regional consortium participating in the California Student Opportunity Access Program established pursuant to Chapter 113 of the Statutes of 1978, appointed by the Student Aid Commission.

(d) Two representatives of the California Community Colleges, to be appointed by the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, at least one of whom shall be a faculty member.

(e) Two representatives of the California State University, to be appointed by the Chancellor of the California State University, at least one of whom shall be a faculty member.

(f) Two representatives of the University of California, appointed by the President of the University of California, at least one of which shall be a faculty member.

(g) One representative, appointed by the Director of the California Postsecondary Education Commission.

Faculty appointments to the advisory committee shall be made by the appropriate appointing authority through consultation with the faculty senate.

SEC. 3. Section 11002 of the Education Code is amended to read:

11002. The advisory committee shall make recommendations regarding all of the following:

(a) Development of criteria for awarding grants pursuant to Section 11001.

(b) Development of criteria for determining the priority ranking of schools selected to receive assistance under the California Academic Partnership Program.

(c) Development of criteria for identifying projects which are ineffective.

(d) Development of options identifying additional resources and efforts which promote the objectives of the program.

(e) Development of a general policy for cooperative diagnostic testing of secondary students with assessment instruments commonly used by California postsecondary educational institutions.

SEC. 4. Section 11003 of the Education Code is amended to read:

11003. (a) A school district together with a postsecondary educational institution or a consortium of postsecondary educational institutions may submit a joint application to the Chancellor of the California State University for a grant to fund a project intended to improve student performance in secondary schools. The advisory committee shall give consideration to the following, in addition to its own criteria for the recommendation of programs for funding:

(1) The inclusion of a comprehensive plan for curricular revision or enhancement and instructional change.

(2) The participation of postsecondary campus faculty working as equal partners with secondary school teachers in efforts to improve the academic quality of college preparatory instruction.

(3) The provision of activities and services designed to enhance

the ability of students to benefit from college preparatory curricula.

(4) The provision of in-service training designed to increase college aspirations of students from groups with low participation rates in postsecondary institutions.

(5) The inclusion of procedures for the independent evaluation of the program budget.

(6) Plans for the participation of more than one secondary school.

(7) Plans for the inclusion of intermediate or junior high schools in the project.

(8) Plans for the continuation of the project after funding ceases.

(b) Upon receipt of an application submitted pursuant to subdivision (a), the Chancellor of the California State University may award a grant to the joint applicants for purposes of funding the proposed project. Each project which receives a grant pursuant to this subdivision shall provide matching funds from existing funds received from federal, state, local, or private sources or budget increases in those funds, with preference to projects which have the strongest demonstrated institutional commitment. Priority shall be given to projects which serve either of the following:

(1) Schools and school districts utilizing the provisions of Article 4 (commencing with Section 54700) of Chapter 9 of Part 29.

(2) Schools with low student participation in institutions of postsecondary education or with a concentration of students from groups which are underrepresented in postsecondary education, affording priority to those applicants in inverse order of their level of student participation in institutions of postsecondary education authorized to award baccalaureate degrees.

(c) The Chancellor of the California State University, with the assistance of the advisory committee established under Section 11001, and with the advice of faculty from appropriate disciplines, shall establish a voluntary cooperative program for the academic assessment of secondary school students in the state. In developing this system, the chancellor shall take steps necessary to ensure that increased uses of assessment instruments assist in all of the following:

(1) Reducing the demand for remedial programs at the postsecondary level.

(2) Analyzing student readiness for college-level work.

(3) Identifying the academic needs of students for secondary school teachers and counselors.

(4) Encourage and give priority to schools identified in paragraph (2) of subdivision (b) of Section 11003 for the utilization of these instruments.

SEC. 3. Section 11004 of the Education Code is amended to read:

11004. The California Postsecondary Education Commission shall provide a progress report on the California Academic Partnership Program to the Legislature on or before January 1, 1986, and a final evaluation report on or before January 1, 1988. The evaluation shall include, but need not be limited to, indicators of increases in the

number of students enrolled in postsecondary educational institutions, indicators of students' improved preparation for baccalaureate work, reductions in dropout rates, and the assessment of the effectiveness of the program by participating school districts and postsecondary institutions, together with recommendations from the commission for the improvement of the program.

SEC. 6. Section 11005 of the Education Code is amended to read:

11005. Based upon evaluations conducted pursuant to Section 11004, the California Postsecondary Education Commission may identify projects which are ineffective or not cost-effective for termination. Funds made available as a result of that termination shall be reallocated for the awarding of new grants pursuant to Section 11003.

SEC. 7. This act is an urgency statute necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, or safety within the meaning of Article IV of the Constitution and shall go into immediate effect. The facts constituting the necessity are:

In order to ensure that the selection processes and criteria prescribed in this act will be implemented for the California Academic Partnership Program for the 1984–85 school year, it is necessary that this act take effect immediately.

APPENDIX B

LIST OF CAPP CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS 1984 - 1987

1. Five Star Academic Partnership: Fillmore USD. Norwalk-La Mirada USD. UCLA. UC Santa Barbara. Cerritos College.

2. A Junior MESA Program For Rural and Metropolitan Students: CSU, Bakersfield. Arvin Union SD. Bakersfield College. Bakersfield SD. Earlimart SD. Fairfax SD. Fruitdale SD.

3. Ethnic Literature - A Model For Teaching Critical Thinking Skills: CSU, Sacramento. Grant UHSD.

4. Language Across the Curriculum - "Learning from Text": CSU, Northridge. Los Angeles USD.

5. Academic Partnership to Improve Social Studies Curriculum: Sonoma State University. Cotati-Rohnert Park University SD.

6. High School/College Partnership Produces Prepared Students: Sacramento City College. Sacramento City USD.

7. Project STEP - Student/Teacher Educational Partnership: A Model for Intersegmental Cooperation: UC Irvine. Santa Ana USD. CSU, Fullerton. Rancho Santiago College. Chapman College.

8. Academic Partnership - PVUSD-UCSC: UC Santa Cruz. Pajaro Valley USD.

9. Preparing Students for University Level Academic Writing: Montebello USD. UCLA.

10. The Quantitative Education Development Project (QED): San Diego City Schools. San Diego County Consortium.

11. Linking Resources for Students Underrepresentd in Higher Education: Santa Barbara HSD. UC Santa Barbara. Santa Barbara CC.

12. Mathematics: New Courses in the 9 - 12 Academic Preparatory Sequence: UC Davis. CSU, Sacramento. San Juan USD. Sacramento USD. Grant Joint USD. Elk Grove SD.

13. Academic Partnership to Improve Collegiate Preparation: UCLA. Los Angeles USD. L.A. Harbor CC.

14. College Aspiration Partnership Program: ABC USD. UC Irvine. Cerritos College.

15. The Mathematics Awareness and Skill Development Program: South Coast

EOP/s Consortium. Whittier UHSD. CSPU, Pomona. Rio Hondo CC. Whittier College.

16. The College Preparatory Tutorial Center Project: CSU, Dominguez Hills. Centinela Valley USD. El Camino CC.

17. Comprehensive Math and Language Articulation and Tutorial Program: Southwestern College. Sweetwater UHSD. San Diego State University.

18. Science and English Curiculum Project: Newark SD. CSU, Hayward. Ohlone College.

19. Social Studies and Science Curriculum Development and Implementation in Three Strands: Vacaville USD. SUCCESS Consortium. UC Davis. University of the Pacific. Sonoma State University. Solano CC.

20. SHARP: Stockton Honors Advanced Placement Recognition Program: Stockton USD. University of the Pacific.

APPENDIX C.

Characteristics of the California Academic Partnership Program Projects

Project	Curricular Specialty					Groups Served		
	Math	Science	Social Science	Language Arts	Critical Thinking Skills	Grades	Number of Students 1984-87	Number of Teachers 1984-87
1. Five Star Academic Partnership	X	X				7-12	8,000	80
2. A Junior MESA Program for Rural and Metropolitan Students	X	X		X	X	7-9	900 +	80
3. Ethnic Literature: A Model for Teaching Critical Thinking Skills				X	X	8,9,10	500	
4. Language Instruction Across the Content Areas: Learning From Text				in content areas	X	6-12	2,300	240
5. Academic Partnership to Improve Social Studies Curriculum			X			11-12	500	
6. High School/College Partnership Produces Prepared Students		writing	writing	writing		7-12	5,000 +	
7. Project Step	X	X		writing/reading	X	9	3,300	
8. Academic Partnership	X	X	X	X		8,9,10	5,350	20
9. College Partnership Produces Prepared Students				X	X	7,9,11	300	
10. The Quantitative Educational Development Project	X	X			X	8	900	8
11. Linking Resources for Students Underrepresented in Higher Education	X			X		6-8	500	
12. Mathematics: New Courses in the 9-12 Academic Preparation Sequence	X				X	7,8,12	1,000 +	40 +
13. Academic Partnership to Improve College Preparation	X	X		X		7-12	2,000 +	
14. College Aspiration Partnership Program	X			X		7-12	316	
15. The Mathematics Awareness and Skill Development Program	X					7-12	1,000 +	
16. The College Preparatory Tutorial Center Project	X			X		10	1,000 +	100 +
17. Comprehensive Math and Language Articulation and Tutorial Program	X			X		7-12	43,200	
18. Science and English Curriculum Project		X		X		11-12	1,600 +	
19. Social Studies and Science Curriculum Development in Three Strands		X	X	writing	X	6-12	700 +	30
20. Stockton Honors Advancement Placement Recognition Program (SHARP)	X	X	X	X		10-12	2,000	
A. California State University / University of California Mathematics Diagnostic Testing Project	X					9-12	400,000 +	5,500
B. High School Diagnostic Testing Program in Composition				writing		11	2,250	
C. University of California and California State University Writing Exam for Eleventh Graders				writing		11	2,000 +	

- *Characteristics of the California Academic Partnership Program Projects (continued)*

Project	Inservice Workshops			Tutorial			Counseling Guidance	Articulation		
	Teacher	Counselor	Parent	Peer	College Student	Testing	Orientation	Curriculum	Support Service	Information
1.	X		X	X			X	X		
2.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
3.	X		X			X	X			
4.	X							X		
5.										
6.	X					X	X			
7.	X				X		X			
8.	X				X		X			
9.	X					X	X	X		
10.	X				X	X				X
11.					X		X			
12.	X					X				
13.	X	X			X	X	X			
14.			X	X			X			
15.	X			X	X	X				
16.	X				X	X	X			
17.	X		X	X						X
18.	X									
19.	X				X		X	X		
20.	X	X			X		X			
A.										
B.										
C.										

Characteristics of the California Academic Partnership Program Projects (continued)

Project	Curriculum Development	Curriculum Revision	Forums/Seminars Teachers	Forums/Seminars Parents	Forums/Seminars Students	Team Teaching	Field Trips	Teacher Liaison with Parents	Summer Programs Teachers	Summer Programs Students	Conferences
1	x		x	x	x	x			x		x
2.	x	x					x	x		x	
3.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	
4.	x	x	x			x			x		
5.	x	x				x					
6.	x										
7.	x	x							x		x
8.	x	x			x					x	
9.	x	x	x				x	x			
10.	x					x					
11.	x							x		x	
	x		x						x		
13.			x								
14.		x				x					
15.		x				x					
16.	x						x				
17.		x			x						
18.		x									
19.	x	x	x			x				x	
20.		x									x
A.											
B.											
C.											

APPENDIX D.

March 31, 1987

PLAN FOR EVALUATION SESSIONS

A. Purpose:

- To gather the collective perceptions of CAPP project partners regarding their successful and unsuccessful experiences in carrying out CAPP "curriculum" projects.

- To document these perceptions in a report which would serve as a:

  1. Supplement to the CAPP Final Summative Evaluation Reports which are envisioned to be based upon measurable outcomes of intended project objectives.

  2. Basis upon which the CPEC evaluator could form judgements about the effectiveness of CAPP.

  3. Source of advise and guidance to new CAPP curriculum projects as well as to others interested in partnership efforts.

  4. Source for potential distribution of information regarding CAPP and its effects.

  5. Add to the literature regarding intersegmental/partnership models.

B. Timing:

- Two sessions: one in Northern California, one in the South.

- Tentative Dates: April 30 (S), May 1 (N).

C. Format:

1. Pre-session Activity

   - Letter to each partner site project director

     - Identify a team of individuals to attend session

     - Team equals - at least one person from each partner institution, and at least one faculty member/teacher and one curriculum specialist

     - This session will serve as part of your final evaluation report

- Meet with team prior to session to discuss and bring a written response to: What have you learned (pro and con) regarding:

a. The best way to realize a honest and effective partnership:

- Administrative Structure
- To promote faculty working with faculty
  - Incentives for cooperation
  - Identification of interested faculty

b. The best way to assist schools/school districts to enhance curriculum.

c. The best way to target academic preparation efforts for underrepresented students.

d. The best way to evaluate the effectiveness of the program's efforts.

e. The best way to institutionalize (continue) partnership.

f. The best way to disseminate information about the project:

- Within the project institutions
- To external audiences

g. Extent to which CAPP Advisory Board/Director/Evaluator have been/could have been helpful

h. Other unintended outcomes which have helped or hindered the program

- Prepare structured question/response sheets for small group session facilitators

8. Session Agenda:

8:30 - 10:00 a.m. - Breakfast with and training of small group facilitators

- Facilitators serve to guide discussion/collect small session information

Need: - Identify Facilitators - 4 per session

- Pre-session instructions to facilitators

- Collect written responses from project directors just before the workshops begin.

10:00 - 10:30 a.m. - Welcome

Opening Remarks - Purpose

- Anticipated Outcomes

- Structure of Day

Respond to Questions

10:30 - 11:30 a.m. - Plenary Working Session through items:

a. What unintended outcomes were discovered during the conduct of the project

(b. and c. if there is time)

b. What is the best way to realize a honest and effective partnership:

- Administrative Structure

- To promote faculty working with faculty

- Incentives for cooperation

- Identification of interested faculty

c. What is the best way to assist schools/school districts to enhance curriculum.

- To model the process for the day

- To gain broad interactions on three key items

11:30 - 12:30 - Segmental Group Meetings

- One Facilitator per Group

- Four Groups: - Schools
  - Community Colleges
  - CSU
  - UC

  (Individuals from Independent Postsecondary Institutions can join any postsecondary group)

- To focus on issues <u>by</u> <u>segment</u>:

  a. The best way to realize a honest and effective partnership:
     - Administrative Structure
     - To promote faculty working with faculty
       - Incentives for cooperation
       - Identification of interested faculty

  b. The best way to assist schools/school districts to enhance curriculum.

  c. Other comments related to particular nuances of interaction with other segments.

12:30 - 1:30 p.m. - Lunch at tables with individuals making-up afternoon groups

- Afternoon groups (no more than 5) made-up of individuals from different teams, representing various segments. Teams <u>assigned</u> by evaluator.

1:30 -3:30 p.m. - Afternoon Group Sessions

- One facilitator per group
- Groups work through items
- Items presented in various orders for each group so that each item is covered to some extent.

3:30 - 4:00 p.m. - Wrap-up

- Respond to questions
- Evaluation of session
- Thank participants

3. Post Session:

- Collect Information from Facilitators
- Debrief Facilitators by Item
- Write Report

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

APPENDIX E

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92717

February 24, 1988

Dear CAPP Project Director:

At the Fall CAPP Project Director's retreat a copy of the CAPP Report entitled: Effective Relationships for School/College Partnerships was distributed and discussed. One of the purposes of the report was to directly assist you in developing and implementing your partnership effort. The attached survey is an attempt to determine if the report was helpful to you, and if so to what extent. It is also a "mini" qualitative study in itself, in that it asks questions about your current experiences with your CAPP project.

In order to save you time and facilitate responding to the survey, you do not have to fill it out! Rather, I will be calling you to talk through the items on the survey. I am targeting March 4th and 7th for these telephone calls. Barbara Trok from my office will be setting up times which are convenient for you. This should take no longer than one/half hour.

Thank you for your help and assistance. Your collective responses to the survey will be made available to you in the Spring.

Sincerely,

Dennis J. Galligani, Ph.D.
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs

DJG:bt

Enclosure

cc: Director Deborah Osen Hancock

APPENDIX E

24 February 1988

CAPP PROJECT DIRECTOR SURVEY

Usefulness of CAPP Report:

Effective Relationships for School/College Partnerships

A. At the Fall 1987 CAPP Directors Meeting a copy of the above named report was distributed.

- Have you read or referred to the report:

4 Yes, all of it

2 Yes, some of it

1 No (respondent did not wish to be surveyed)

(If no, please respond to the "c" items in parts B.,C. and D. and also item F.)

(If yes, please continue)

B. Were the nine characteristics which were found to contribute to effective partnerships helpful to you in establishing your partnership?

Comments:	Very Helpful	Helpful	Not Helpful
a. If helpful, how?	2	4	0

b. If not helpful, why?

c. What have you learned about characteristics which help develop successful partnerships?

C. Did you find sections of the report helpful/useful...:

1. in forming the administrative structure of your partnership.....	Very Helpful	Helpful	Not Helpful
Comments:	1	5	0

a. If helpful, how?

b. If not helpful, why?

c. What have you learned about developing successful administrative structures?

		Very Helpful	Helpful	Not Helpful	Not Used
2.	in promoting the interaction between postsecondary and school's faculty.....	2	3	0	1

Comments:

a. If helpful, how?

b. If not helpful, why?

c. What have you learned about promoting successful faculty-to-faculty interaction?

		Very Helpful	Helpful	Not Helpful	Not Used
3.	in identifying incentives for interinstitutional cooperation.....	1	4	0	1

Comments:

a. If helpful, how?

b. If not helpful, why?

c. What have you learned about providing successful incentives for interinstitutional cooperation?

		Very Helpful	Helpful	Not Helpful	Not Used
4.	in assisting postsecondary institutions and schools to work collaboratively to enhance curriculum.....	0	4	1	1

Comments:

a. If helpful, how?

b. If not helpful, why?

c. What have you learned about ways to enhance curriculum?

5. in identifying ways to involve underrepresented students to participate in your CAPP efforts....

Very Helpful	Helpful	Not Helpful
1	4	1

Comments:

a. If helpful, how?

b. If not helpful, why?

c. What have you learned about ways to successfully involve underrepresented students?

D. Did you learn anything useful from the former CAPP projects' unintended outcomes?.....

Very Useful	Useful	Not Useful	Not Used
0	5	0	1

Comments:

a. If useful, how?

b. If not useful, why?

c. What unintended outcomes have you experienced?

E. In general, was the report.....

Very Helpful	Helpful	Not Helpful
4	2	0

Comment:

F. Would you recommend a qualitative evaluation be held of the curent CAPP projects? Yes 6 No 0

If yes, when?

G. Any other comments about the School/College Partnership Report?

Thank you for your participation.